

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please add the attached drawing sheets 5 and 6 (Figures 6 and 7) to the application.

Attachment: 2 Drawing Sheet(s)

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 8-20 are pending in the application. In the Office action dated January 9, 2008, claims 10 and 14-20 are rejected and claims 1, 8, 9 and 11-13 are allowed. In response to the Office action, Applicant has cancelled claims 15-20 and amended claim 14.

Applicant respectfully requests that the above amendments be entered and the following remarks be considered. However, in order to guarantee consideration of the present response, Applicant has

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 10, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. That is, the Examiner asserts that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

With particular regards to claim 10, the Examiner asserts that the recitation that the movable casing of the claimed locking device "completely surrounds" the stem is not supported by the disclosure as originally filed. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The present application corresponds to a national phase under 35 U.S.C. § 371 of International Application no. PCT/NO2004/000188, which was published as International Publication no. WO 2005/002946. In the specification as filed and published at page 3, lines 3-8, the application states:

In the present embodiment, the locking device 1 is formed as a casing 4 around the figure of the stem as shown in Figure 3, and may glide up and down along the stem 2. The casing 4 may surround the stem 2 completely, or have an open

side and possibly rails gripping into corresponding tracks in the longitudinal direction of the stem 2. (emphasis added)

In view of the clear disclosure of the subject matter of claim 10 in the specification as originally filed, Applicant suggests that claim 10 complies with the written description requirement.

With particular regards to claim 14, the Examiner asserts that the recitation that the locking device "is a bracket to the module" is not supported by the originally filed disclosure. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant notes that the specification as filed recites at page 4, lines 3-7, that "The locking device may possibly contain fastening or coupling means, making it possible to fasten modules to it, such as a baby seat, a luggage holder, or a bracket for such modules." Although Applicant believes this provides sufficient disclosure to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, Applicant has nevertheless amended claim 14 to recite a locking device that "includes a bracket for the module"

Applicant suggests that, in view of the disclosure at page 4, lines 1-7, the subject matter of claim 14 is clearly disclosed in the specification as originally, and that claim 14 therefore complies with the written description requirement.

in view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 10 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully disagrees, and suggests that

the subject matter of claim 18 is described in the disclosure in such a manner that one of ordinary skill in the art could make and use the invention without undue experimentation. However, in view of the cancellation of claim 18, Applicant suggests that the rejection is rendered moot.

Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees, and suggests that in view of the contents of the disclosure, the teachings of the prior art, and the claim interpretation that would be understood by an artisan of ordinary skill, claims 15-20 define the claimed invention with clarity and precision. However, in view of the cancellation of claims 15-20, Applicant suggests that the rejections are rendered moot.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), in that the Examiner asserts that the drawings fail to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Examiner suggests that a casing that "completely surrounds" the stem, and a locking device that "is a bracket to the module" have not been shown in the drawings.

As discussed above, the subject matter identified by the Examiner is clearly disclosed in the specification. Furthermore, the disclosure states that the locking device "may be formed as a casing 4 around the figure of the stem as shown in Figure 3" and that "the casing 4 may surround the stem 2 completely" (at page 3, lines 3-8). Similarly, that the locking device may include a bracket for fastening a module to the stem is also clearly disclosed at page 4, lines 1-7.

In the interest of furthering the prosecution of the application, Applicant has added new drawing Figures 6 and 7, which clearly show a casing 4 that completely surrounds a stem 2, and a bracket 9 for fastening a module, respectively.

In view of the amendments to the drawings, Applicant respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Komori (US 2,904,102).

Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by McClary (US 1,334,771).

Without acknowledging the propriety of the rejection, and in the interest of facilitating the allowance of the application, Applicant has canceled claims 15-20 without prejudice to further prosecution in a continuing application.

In view of the cancellation of claims 15-20, Applicant respectfully suggests the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is rendered moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicates that claims 1, 8, 9 and 11-13 are allowed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter, and suggests that in view of the above amendments and remarks, claims 10 and 14 are similarly in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner issue a Notice of

Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned agent of record.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted electronically via the United States Patent and Trademark Office's EFS-Web System on July 9, 2008.

Allison M. Deverman Vietor

Allison M. Deverman Vietor

Respectfully submitted,

KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.

Anton E. Skaugset

Anton E. Skaugset

Registration No. 38,617

Customer No. 23581

Agent for Applicant(s)/Assignee

520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200

Portland, Oregon 97204

Telephone: (503) 224-6655

Facsimile: (503) 295-6679